

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7-9, 15, 16, and 33-37 are pending, with claims 1, 15, 33, and 34 being independent. Claims 2-3, 6, 10-14, and 17-32 have been cancelled, and claim 34 has been amended to correct a typographical error. For example, claim 34 now recites a feature similar to a feature of claims 1 and 33. No new matter has been introduced, and entry of the amendment after the final rejection is appropriate.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the interview conducted by applicants' undersigned representative on October 15, 2010 and continued on October 26, 2010. During the interview, claim 1 and the positions of the Office set forth in the office action dated July 16, 2010 were discussed, and no agreement was reached with respect to any claim. In particular, the Examiner explained the position of the Office that Goodman discloses using multiple factors to determine whether a sender is a spammer. Further details of the substance of the interview are reflected in this response.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 15, 16, and 33-37 were rejected as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0021649 ("Goodman") in view of United States Patent No. 5,933,811 ("Angles").

As to claim 1, Goodman and Angles, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest "determining if the advertiser was previously determined to be a trusted advertiser," "submitting, in response to determining that the advertiser was previously determined to be a trusted advertiser, the advertisements in the set of advertisements for review using an automated review process," and "in response to determining that the advertiser was not previously determined to be a trusted advertiser: selecting a subset of the set of advertisements; [and] submitting the subset of advertisements to be reviewed to a manual review process for approving or disapproving an advertisement based on the content of the advertisement," as recited in claim 1. In particular, with respect to these features, the Office cited paragraphs 98, 99, and 110 of Goodman, which refer to FIGS. 7-9 of Goodman. *See* office action at pages 2-3. As shown in FIGS. 7-9 of

Goodman, however, the cited portion of Goodman refers only to “techniques to determine that a sender is a potential spammer” and “various actions [that] can be taken against the sender.” *See* paragraphs 98 and 99 of Goodman. As shown in FIG. 8 of Goodman, one of the actions “involves manually inspecting at least a subset of the potential spammer’s outgoing messages. Thus, Goodman fails to disclose “determining if the advertiser was previously determined to be a trusted advertiser,” (emphasis added) and employing different review processes based on whether the advertiser was previously determined to be a trusted advertiser.

Additionally, as disclosed by Goodman, the manual review process discussed in paragraph 110 of Goodman is employed as an action against a sender based a determination that a sender is a potential spammer. Thus, despite Goodman’s disclosure of a manual review process, Goodman fails to disclose “submitting the subset of advertisements to be reviewed to a manual review process” “in response to determining that the advertiser was not previously determined to be a trusted advertiser,” as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, Goodman and Angles, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest “determining a trust score for the advertiser using information based on the manual review of the subset of advertisements, wherein determining the trust score for the advertiser comprises determining a first amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a first reason, determining a second amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a second reason, applying a first weighting factor to the first amount of advertisements to generate a first trust score component, applying a second weighting factor to the second amount of advertisements to generate a second trust score component, and generating the trust score based on the first trust score component and the second trust score component,” as also recited in claim 1. With respect to these features, the Office cited paragraphs 57, 62, 78, 101, and 110-112 of Goodman. *See* office action at page 3. The cited portions of Goodman, however, fail to disclose “determining a first amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a first reason” and “determining a second amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a second reason.” In particular, the cited portions of Goodman disclose that “scores are calculated to result in a total score per message and/or a total score per sender,” and “assess[ing] the degree of certainty that the sender is a spammer by weighing the score information.” *See* paragraphs 57 and 78 of Goodman.

As discussed in paragraphs 55 and 56 of Goodman, the disclosure of Goodman regarding total scores relates to adding individual scores for each message generated by filters through which the message is passed, and the messages of Goodman are determined to be spam based on a combination of various factors. For example, Goodman states that “more than one score can be assigned to each message depending on the number and types of filters,” and “the processor can compute a sum total of all scores per message and/or a sum of all message scores per sender.” *See* paragraph 55 of Goodman. Thus, Goodman discloses adding scores from multiple filters to determine whether a message is likely to be spam, and adding the total scores of all messages from a sender to determine whether the sender is a spammer. Therefore, Goodman fails to disclose that each message is “declined for a first reason” or “declined for a second reason,” as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Goodman also fails to disclose or suggest “applying a first weighting factor to the first amount of advertisements [declined for the first reason] to generate a first trust score component,” “applying a second weighting factor to the second amount of advertisements [declined for the second reason] to generate a second trust score component,” and “generating the trust score [for the advertiser] based on the first trust score component and the second trust score component,” as also recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 5, 7-9, and 35-37 should be withdrawn.

Though not identical, claims 15, 33, and 34 recite features similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. For example, claim 15 recites “determining a trust score using information concerning disapproved advertisements in the subset, approved advertisements in the subset, and reasons for any disapprovals,” and each of claims 33 and 34 recites “determining a first amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a first reason, determining a second amount of advertisements in the subset declined for a second reason, applying a first weighting factor to the first amount of advertisements to generate a first trust score component, applying a second weighting factor to the second amount of advertisements to generate a second trust score component, and generating the trust score based on the first trust score component and the second trust score component.” Thus, for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1, the rejections of claims 15 and its dependent claim 16, claim 33, and claim 34 should be withdrawn.

Applicant : Kristin Coit et al
Serial No. : 10/814,102
Filed : March 31, 2004
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0769001

Payment in the amount of \$1,650.00 for the requisite fee for a three-month extension of time and for the requisite fee for a notice of appeal is made with this filing on the Electronic Filing System by deposit account authorization. Please apply any charges or and credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 18, 2011

/George P. Bonanto/
George P. Bonanto
Reg. No. 59,717

Customer Number 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

40685583